



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/880,675	06/23/97	LEE	J P54346

LM02/0402

ROBERT E BUSHNELL
1511 K STREET N W SUITE 425
WASHINGTON DC 20005-1401

EXAMINER

HARVEY, D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2714

3

DATE MAILED:

04/02/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
08/880,675

Applicant(s)
Lee

Examiner
DAVID HARVEY

Group Art Unit
2714



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jun 23, 1997

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☒ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☒ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2714

1. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

1) The use of the term “separating” in lines 1 and 6 of claim 1 is confusing, appears to be misdescriptive, and/or at least appears to be “very” limited. The examiner notes the following:

A) As disclosed, it appears that the alleged invention operates: a) to receive a composite sync signal and/or separate vertical and horizontal sync signals; and b) in response to the received sync signals, to output separate vertical and horizontal sync signals having specific/desired polarity.

B) Given the operation of the alleged invention as is set forth in part “A” above, the examiner points out that the limitations of claim 1 only appear to be true/accurate when the alleged invention receives and processes composite sync signals because only in this case are the vertical and horizontal sync signals actually separated from each other as is currently recited in line 6 of claim 1. More specifically, in the case that separate horizontal and vertical sync signals are received and processed by the alleged invention, no “separating step” appears to occur and instead the separate sync inputs seem to be passed to respective outputs unchanged in every respect except for, possibly, their polarities. Thus claim 1 as

Art Unit: 2714

currently drafted actually appears to exclude the situation(s) in which the alleged invention receives and processes separate horizontal and vertical sync signals.

Clarification is required.

2) Claims 2-23 are confusing for the same reason that was set forth for claim 1 above.

Clarification is required.

2.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inui [JP 5-244450] view of Perkins [U.S. 4,800,429].

I. The Showing of Inui:

Inui has been cited because it illustrates a system for detecting and/or separating vertical and horizontal synchronous signals. The system comprises:

A) a plurality of input terminals (12, 14, 15, 16) which include: 1) a vertical synchronous signal terminal (@16); 2) a horizontal synchronous terminal (@ 15);

Art Unit: 2714

3) a composite synchronous terminal (@14); and 4) a synchronous-on-green terminal (@ 12) [see figure on cover page];

B) means (17) for checking signal inputted at plurality of input terminals in order to detect inputted forms of said vertical and horizontal synchronous signals [see discussion on cover page];

D) means (1,2,3,4,5) for “*separating*”¹ and/or outputting separate horizontal (“a”) and vertical (“b”) synchronous signals in accordance with the inputted forms that were detected by the detecting means [see the figure and the discussion on the cover page].

II. Differences:

Claim 1 appears to differ from the showing of Inui only in the Inui does not show means for ensuring that the horizontal (“a”) and vertical (“b”) outputs of his system have a predetermined polarity.

¹ Note paragraph 1 of this Office action

Art Unit: 2714

III. The showing of Perkins:

As in the case of Inui, Perkins also illustrates a system for detecting and/or separating vertical and horizontal synchronous signals and also discloses a system which comprises a plurality of input terminals (12, 14, 16) which include: 1) a vertical synchronous signal terminal (@12); 2) a horizontal/composite synchronous terminal (@ 14); and 3) a synchronous-on-green terminal (@ 16) [note: the figure; and lines 31-34 of column 2]. However, unlike Inui, Perkins recognized that the composite and/or separate sync signals provided at the input terminals were known to have been of different polarities and, being such, means had to be provided within the system to ensure that the outputted signal had a specific/desired polarity [see lines 12-19 of column 1].

IV. Obviousness:

In view of the teachings of Perkins, the examiner maintains that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have modified the system disclosed by Inui with the “polarity correction means” that would have been required so as to have ensured that the vertical and horizontal outputs of the system were always of a specific/predetermined polarity given any possible polarity of the inputs. Motivation for this modification would have been provided by the known desire/need to make such systems compatible with any and all computer inputs [see lines 12-19 in column 1 of Perkins].

Art Unit: 2714

4. Claims 2-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inui [JP 5-244450] view of Perkins [U.S. 4,800,429] for the same reasons that were set forth in paragraph 3 of this Office action.


5. The examiner notes that the art of record has been applied to the claims to the extent of the examiner's understanding in view of the section 112 problem(s) noted in paragraph 1 of this Office action.

6. U.S. Patent #4,583,119 to Roscoe, U.S. Patent #4,894,719 to Moon, U.S. Patent #4,709,267 to Sendelweck, and U.S. Patent #5,502,498 to Park et al. have all been cited to evidence conventional Sync interface circuitry.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. Harvey whose telephone number is (703) 305-4365.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

DEH 3/99


DAVID E. HARVEY
PRIMARY EXAMINER